

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed October 5, 2005. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1-17 were pending in the application. In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 1-17. To advance prosecution of this case, Applicant amends Claims 1, 5, and 8-17. In addition, Applicant adds new Claims 18-19. Applicant does not admit that any amendments are necessary due to any prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Section 102 Rejections

Johnston

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-2, 4-5, 12, 14, and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,404,444 issued to Johnston, et al. ("*Johnston*"). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-2, 4-5, 12, 14, and 16.

Johnston fails to teach, suggest, or disclose at least two aspects of amended Claim 1. First, the cited reference does not teach, suggest, or disclose "displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects" as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Second, *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that "the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network" as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1.

First, the cited reference does not teach, suggest, or disclose "displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects" as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner relies on a portion of *Johnston* that discloses the display of a stack of cylinder sections. (*Johnston*; Fig. 3C; col. 5, ll. 7-19). *Johnston* teaches that the stack represents a resource, such as a memory module. (*Johnston*; col. 4, ll. 27-29; Claim 4). In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner states that "the resource is a property of the object -- data processing system 200." (Office Action; p. 2, ¶ 6). Thus, the Examiner equates "data processing system 200" described in *Johnston* with the particular "object" recited in amended Claim 1. The display in *Johnston*, however, relates only to a

single data processing system. (*Johnston*; Figs. 2-3). There is nothing in *Johnston* that teaches, suggests, or discloses a display related to a plurality of data processing systems. Because the Examiner equates the “data processing system” with an “object,” the display in *Johnston* does not relate to a “plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Thus, *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Because *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose this aspect of amended Claim 1, *Johnston* fails to support the rejection.

Second, *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that “the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. *Johnston* discloses a display of a stack of cylinders in order to present resource information (*Johnston*; col. 5, ll. 7-11). The stack of cylinders, however, is not “arranged according to locations of the associated objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Furthermore, there is nothing in *Johnston* that teaches, suggests, or discloses “locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that “the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Because *Johnston* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose this element of amended Claim 1, *Johnston* fails to support the rejection. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1.

In rejecting Claims 12, 14, and 16, the Examiner employs the same rationale used with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated with respect to amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claims 12, 14, and 16.

Claims 2 and 4 and amended Claim 5 depend from amended Claim 1, shown above to be allowable. In addition, these claims recite further elements not taught, suggested, or disclosed by *Johnston*. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 2 and 4 and amended Claim 5.

Jamieson

The Examiner rejects Claims 1, 6-11, 13, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,577,323 issued to Jamieson, et al. (“*Jamieson*”). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1, 6-11, 13, 15, and 17.

Jamieson fails to teach, suggest, or disclose at least two aspects of amended Claim 1. First, *Jamieson* does not teach, suggest, or disclose “displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Second, *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that “the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1.

First, *Jamieson* does not teach, suggest, or disclose “displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner relies upon a portion of *Jamieson* that describes a display of a signal trend analysis of a plant, such as a nuclear plant. (*Jamieson*; col. 14, ll. 16-37; Fig. 5A). The Examiner equates the plant with an “object” and the plant component icons 161-164 with “properties.” (Office Action; p. 6, ¶ 13) (asserting that “each component 161-164 is a property of the plant”). Notably, the display in *Jamieson* only relates to a single plant. (*Jamieson*; Figs. 3-5A). For example, all of the data in the display depicted in Figure 3 relates to a single plant. (*Jamieson*; Fig. 3). In contrast to the display in *Jamieson*, amended Claim 1 recites “displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects.” Because the Examiner equates the “plant” with an “object,” the display in *Jamieson* only relates to a single object, not “a plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose “displaying a plurality of icons, wherein the icons are associated with a plurality of objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Because *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose this aspect of amended Claim 1, *Jamieson* fails to support the rejection.

Second, *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that “the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. In rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner relies on a portion of *Jamieson* that

discloses a display of a signal trend analysis. (*Jamieson*; col. 14, ll. 16-37; Fig. 5A). None of the items described in the display are “arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. (*Jamieson*; col. 14, ll. 16-37; Fig. 5A). Furthermore, there is nothing in *Jamieson* that teaches, suggests, or discloses arranging anything “according to locations of the associated objects” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose that “the icons are arranged according to locations of the associated objects as deployed in a network” as recited, in part, in amended Claim 1. Because *Jamieson* fails to teach, suggest, or disclose this aspect of amended Claim 1, *Jamieson* fails to support the rejection. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claim 1.

In rejecting Claims 8, 13, 15, and 17, the Examiner employs the same rationale used with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons stated with respect to amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended Claims 8, 13, 15, and 17.

Claims 6-7 and amended Claims 9-11 depend from independent claims shown above to be allowable. In addition, these claims recited further elements not taught, suggested, or disclosed by *Jamieson*. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 6-7 and amended Claims 9-11.

Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Johnston* as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,937,037 issued to Griffiths, et al. (“*Griffiths*”). Claim 3 depends from amended Claim 1, shown above to be allowable. In addition, Claim 3 recites further elements not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the *Johnston-Griffiths* combination. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claim 3.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.:
063170.7002(20000116)

PATENT APPLICATION
09/982,270

15

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to further the prosecution of this Application, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned attorney at (214) 953-6581 at the Examiner's convenience.

Although no fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicant



Samir A. Bhavsar
Reg. No. 41,617

Date: December 5, 2005

Correspondence Address:

Customer Number: **05073**